

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 14-16, 19, and 23-25 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found on pages 22-24 of the Specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-27 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18-23, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson, *Introduction to PSpice Manual for Electronic Circuits Using OrCad Release 9.1* (hereafter Nilsson), in view of Lawman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,673,198 (hereafter Lawman). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A method of API (application programming interface) generation for an electronic circuit comprising:  
displaying a graphical user interface through which a user can initiate generation of **a new API**, wherein said user utilizes **said new API** to customize functionality of said electronic circuit;  
selecting a component from a plurality of components for placement in said electronic circuit, said component representing an implementable function in said electronic circuit;  
configuring said selected component via said graphical user interface;  
storing descriptive data relative to said selected component and said configuration;  
utilizing said interface to access said descriptive data; and  
initiating said graphical user interface to invoke a processing of said descriptive data causing an automatic generation of **said new API**, in response to a user input, **said new API** comprising a device-interface and interrupt activity framework for source programming and for controlling said function of said component in said electronic circuit.  
(emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Nilsson and Lawman does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, "displaying a graphical user interface through which a user can initiate generation of **a new API**, wherein said user utilizes **said new API** to customize functionality of said electronic circuit," (emphasis added), and "initiating said graphical user interface to invoke a processing of said descriptive data causing an automatic generation of **said new API...said new API** comprising a device-interface and interrupt activity framework," (emphasis added).

At page 4 of the Office Action, it is admitted that Nilsson doesn't specifically teach an API. Further, at page 13 of the Office Action, it is admitted that Lawson is directed to an API that exists for the circuit designing application in instruction memory (19). Also, it is argued that generation of API messages using the existing API in Lawson corresponds to generation of the API.

In contrast to the combination of Nilsson and Lawson, Independent Claim 1 is directed to a new API instead of an existing API. According to Independent Claim 1, a user can initiate generation of a new API, the user utilizes the new API to customize functionality, the graphical user interface is initiated to invoke a processing of the descriptive data causing an automatic generation of the new API, and the new API comprises a device-interface and interrupt activity framework. It is respectfully submitted that the generation of a new API is not equivalent to generating API messages using an existing API.

Thus, the combination of Nilsson and Lawman does not teach, motivate, or suggest all the limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7, and 9 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-5, 7, and 9 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 10 and 19, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 10 and 19 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claims 10 and 19 include limitations directed to displaying a graphical user interface through which a user can initiate the generation of a new API (application programming interface), wherein the user utilizes the new API to customize functionality of an electronic circuit, and directed to initiating the graphical user interface to invoke a processing of the descriptive data causing an automatic generation of the new API. As discussed above, the combination of Nilsson and Lawman fails to teach, suggest, or motivate the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 10 and 19 are allowable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 11-14, 16, and 18 and Dependent Claims 20-23, 25, and 27 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10 and 19, respectively,

which are allowable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 11-14, 16, and 18 and Dependent Claims 20-23, 25, and 27 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 6, 15, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson, *Introduction to PSpice Manual for Electronic Circuits Using OrCad Release 9.1* (hereafter Nilsson), in view of Lawman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,673,198 (hereafter Lawman), and in view of Hsu, U.S. Patent No. 6,138,270 (hereafter Hsu). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 6, 15, and 24 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman. Moreover, Hsu does not teach, motivate, or suggest displaying a graphical user interface through which a user can initiate generation of a new API, wherein the user utilizes the new API to customize functionality of the electronic circuit, and does not teach, motivate, or suggest initiating the graphical user interface to invoke a processing of the descriptive data causing an automatic generation of the new API, as in the invention of Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson, Lawman, and Hsu for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claims 6, 15, and 24 depend from Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 6, 15, and 24 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson, Lawman, and Hsu for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 8, 17, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson, *Introduction to PSpice Manual for Electronic Circuits Using OrCad Release 9.1* (hereafter Nilsson), in view of Lawman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,673,198 (hereafter Lawman), and in view of McDonald, U.S. Patent No. 6,530,065 (hereafter McDonald). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 8, 17, and 26 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Nilsson and Lawman. Moreover, McDonald does not teach, motivate, or suggest displaying a graphical user interface through which a user can initiate generation of a new API, wherein the user utilizes the new API to customize functionality of the electronic circuit, and does not teach, motivate, or suggest initiating the graphical user interface to invoke a processing of the descriptive data causing an automatic generation of the new API, as in the invention of Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson, Lawman, and McDonald for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claims 8, 17, and 26 depend from Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 8, 17, and 26 are patentable over the combination of Nilsson, Lawman, and McDonald for the reasons discussed above.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, remarks, and arguments overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-27) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-27) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

8/4/2006

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060